



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,718	02/13/2002	Takuya Satoh	JP920000451US1	6382
28722	7590	10/03/2003	EXAMINER	
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P. P.O. BOX 969 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969			COOKE, COLLEEN P	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1725	5	
DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,718	SATOH ET AL.	
	Examiner Colleen P Cooke	Art Unit 1725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4,6 and 7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-7 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-3, drawn to a solder ball disposing apparatus, classified in class 414, subclass 15.
- II. Claims 4-7, drawn to a solder ball reflow apparatus, classified in class 228, subclass 41.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as disposing a solder ball to a workpiece and then heated in a simple reflow oven. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mike Noe on 8/7/03 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 4-7. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-3 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuchiya et al. (6336581), in view of Tan (4278867).

Tuchiya et al. teaches (see Figures 1 and 4) a solder ball reflow apparatus including a head gimbal assembly holding unit which is inclined (Column 6, lines 62-67), and optical unit having a laser beam to radiate a prescribed spot diameter onto the solder ball (Column 6, lines 9-18 and Column 7, lines 53-64). Tuchiya et al. teaches that nitrogen gas is supplied from a nozzle at the time of laser irradiation of the solder ball to prevent oxidation (Column 7, lines 65-67) but does not specifically teach that the nitrogen is applied in an “environmental space” as described in claim 1.

Tan teaches chip joining by laser beam and also teaches specifically that this is done in a chamber that is evacuated and then backfilled with an inert gas to prevent oxidation (Column 2, lines 22-26 and abstract).

Regarding claim 6, Tuchiya et al. teaches use of an optical fiber (see 3 of Figure 1 and Column 5, lines 15-17).

Regarding claim 7, Tuchiya et al. does not specifically teach a “jig” but teaches a holding means which would inherently have to be further held or supported in some manner, as the holding means taught (see Figure 4) is not self-supporting. Also, Tan teaches that the chamber includes a work support inside the chamber. Tuchiya et al. does not teach the “accommodating portion” which provides the environmental space. Tan does teach the chamber which has a lower table-like surface and an inert gas supply, and a “work support surface” which would include a jig (see Columns2-3, lines 62-19 and Figure 1)

It would have been obvious to modify the apparatus of Tuchiya et al. by performing the operation within a chamber such as that taught by Tan, as opposed to simply using a nozzle because the chamber would provide a more completely inert atmosphere to better guard against oxidation.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of records does not teach or suggest both the apparatus of claim 4 and the further limitations of claim 5, wherein the suction pad and the optical unit are integrally formed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colleen Cooke, whose telephone number is 703-305-1136. She can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:15-5:45pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Thomas Dunn, can be reached at 703-308-3318. The official fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. The unofficial fax number for this examiner is 703-746-3048.

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

CPC 9/16/2003



TOM DUNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700